CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.520
25 July 1989

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 25 July 1989, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Luvsandorjiin Bayart (Mongolia)

GE.89-62619/0814B

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I declare open the 520th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In accordance with its programme of work, the Conference will today continue its consideration of agenda item 4, entitled "Chemical weapons". However, under rule 30 of the rules of procedure, any representative wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Romania and Poland. I now give the floor to the representative of Romania, Ambassador Dolgu.

Mr. DOLGU (Romania) (translated from French): As you know, a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty, took place in Bucharest on 7 and 8 July. The decision was taken that my country, as the host country, should be entrusted with the task of circulating the documents of the Meeting, to this Conference on Disarmament among others, as official documents of the Conference. The communiqué of the Meeting and the document entitled "For a stable and secure Europe free of nuclear and chemical weapons, for a substantial reduction of armed forces, armaments and military spending", which will be circulated shortly, speak for themselves. They constitute an appeal to the member countries of NATO, to the other States in the world, to act together in order to establish a new policy of peace, co-operation and perfect equality of rights that will guarantee the free and independent development of all nations. On behalf of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Romania, I have the honour to submit these documents to you today.

At Bucharest the participants in the Meeting held an exchange of views on developments in the international situation and discussed the main directions of action by the allied States in the interests of the consolidation of peace and stability in Europe, of disarmament and of a broader international co-operation and dialogue. It was noted that owing to the active policy of the socialist countries and to the activities of all peace-loving and realistic forces, there had been certain positive developments in international affairs - the lessening of tension and confrontation, confidence-building, a development of political dialogue and greater contacts between States at various levels. The first steps have been taken in disarmament, a control mechanism has been created and is functioning effectively. The beginning of the Vienna negotiations is encouraging. Co-operation is broadening in the economic, technical, scientific and human rights fields. Progress has been made in the political settlement of regional conflicts. There is a growing readiness on the part of the international community to co-operate in the field of security and in solving global issues.

Nevertheless the world situation continues to be complex and contradictory, since the favourable processes have not yet become irreversible. The build-up of weapons and their modernization has not stopped. Nuclear tests continue, as does work on the militarization of outer space. The concepts of confrontation, of reliance on force, born in the years of the "cold war", are being overcome with difficulty. The nuclear-deterrence

(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

strategy, reaffirmed at the recent session of the NATO Council, is a dangerous anachronism, one which runs counter to the interests of general security. The practice of interference in the domestic affairs of other States and attempts to destabilize them, as well as human rights violations continue.

The participants in the Meeting confirmed the attachment of their States to the ideal of ridding mankind of the danger of war by doing away with nuclear and chemical weapons and drastically reducing conventional weapons. They consider disarmament the cardinal issue of our time, the decisive factor for strengthening peace, security and confidence, deepening détente, developing broad international co-operation and solving global problems. The States represented at the Meeting reaffirmed their determination to do their utmost to reach new agreements in the sphere of disarmament, which should become a continuous and irreversible process.

They declared themselves resolutely in favour of ensuring security not by military but by political means, affirming the primacy of international law in inter-State relations, maintaining normal relations and developing co-operation between States irrespective of their social and political systems, renouncing the policy of confrontation and hostility in favour of one of partnership, mutual understanding, mutual confidence and goodneighbourliness in the interests of all States and all peoples, and co-operating in the sphere of human rights and in the humanitarian field in keeping with the obligations assumed by States. The Bucharest documents note that the promotion of a policy of security, mutual understanding and co-operation among States requires strict respect for national independence and sovereignty, for the equal rights of peoples and the right of each people to self-determination and to a free choice of its path of social and political development, non-interference in others' internal affairs, unconditional renunciation of the use or threat of force in whatever form, the settlement of any disputes between States exclusively by peaceful means, strict respect for today's territorial and political realities, the inviolability of existing borders and the territorial integrity of States, the implementation in every country of human rights and fundamental freedoms in their entirety for all irrespective of race, sex, language, religion or nationality, the development of co-operation between States in various fields on the basis of mutual advantage, conscientious fulfilment of obligations under international law, observance of all the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and all other generally recognized rules of international relations.

In the context of the growing interdependence of today's world, the implementation of all of these principles and provisions will help to consolidate common human values and rules of conduct in international relations. Basing themselves upon the need for a global approach to problems of security, the participants in the Meeting called for security to be achieved through the maintenance of the military balance at the lowest level, sufficient only for defence and excluding the posisibility of sudden attack or the conduct of large-scale offensive operations. The objective aimed at by the States parties is the reduction of armaments to a level which completely eliminates the threat of an outbreak of war.

(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

The participants are ready to continue to seek, together with all interested countries, agreements leading to the progressive reduction and subsequently to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons, the radical reduction of conventional armed forces, the prevention of an extension of the arms race into outer space, the gradual curtailment of military production and the substantial reduction of military spending. In that connection, they proceed from the assumption that disarmament measures must ensure equal security for all States with strict respect for the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of every State within its existing borders, and must exclude the possibility of the use of force or the threat of force in inter-State relations.

Expressing their satisfaction at the resumption of Soviet-United States negotiations on major disarmament issues, the allied States express the hope that they will soon lead to practical results. They consider one of the priority objectives to be the completion of work on the treaty on a 50 per cent reduction in the offensive strategic weapons of the USSR and the United States subject to observance of the ABM Treaty as signed in 1972. The States represented at the Meeting called for the immediate cessation of nuclear tests and for detailed examination of this question, including examination at the multilateral level, at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva. They called for the rapid finalization of the verification protocols to the Soviet-United States agreements of 1974 and 1976 and for the entry into force of these agreements as a step towards the complete prohibition of nuclear tests.

The States parties to the Warsaw Treaty support the idea of the possible extension to underground tests of the applicability of the Moscow Treaty of 1963 banning nuclear tests in three environments as one of the ways of speedily achieving the prohibition of all nuclear tests. The participants in the Meeting expressed their concern at the danger to peace and international security represented by the use of chemical weapons, as long as they exist and spread. The participants call for the speedy preparation of an international convention on the general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles.

A key question of security and stability in Europe, in the view of the participants, is the reduction of conventional armed forces and weapons, the reduction and subsequent elimination of tactical nuclear weapons, and confidence-building on the continent. The participants felt that the immediate objective of talks on conventional armed forces in Europe was to arrive, as previously agreed, at collective ceilings, which will be the same for both the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty States, on the number of troops and the quantities of the main types of armaments in Europe and its various regions. The new levels would be significantly lower than the lowest levels of either side at present. The proposals made in this regard by the allied socialist countries in Vienna provide for a drastic mutual reduction of troops and armaments. This would also solve the problem of eliminating the existing imbalances in conventional weapons. These reductions and limitations of armed forces and armaments should take place under strict international control.

(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

At the Meeting it was noted that additional proposals relating to conventional forces in Europe submitted at the recent summit meeting of the NATO Council constituted a movement towards the position of the allied socialist countries. The participants in the Meeting expect that these proposals will be detailed and submitted at the Vienna negotiations in the near future. The States parties to the Warsaw Treaty reaffirmed their determination to do everything possible for the speedy achievement of results at the Vienna negotiations and expressed the view that the situation at the talks was now such that, given a constructive approach by all participants, it would be possible to arrive at initial arrangements as early as 1990.

In the declaration it is stressed that the practical steps taken by the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty in implementation of their defensive doctrine for unitilateral reduction of their armed forces and armaments, giving them an obvious non-offensive structure and reducing armaments production and military spending, are aimed at the creation of material and political conditions for a steady continuation of the arms limitation process and a lowering of the level of military confrontation. The States parties to the Warsaw Treaty expect the NATO countries to take similar steps with respect to their armed forces, armaments, military expenditure and military activities. The participants in the Meeting called for the observance of the Stockholm agreements, the adoption at negotiations among the 35 States participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe on confidence- and security-building measures of new measures designed to develop them, and the extension of notification, observation and limitation measures to all States' military activities, including the activities of their naval and air forces. The establishment of a centre for reducing the military danger and preventing a surprise attack in Europe, a body with informational and consultative functions, could make an important contribution to building confidence and security and increasing stability on the continent. A major step, capable of raising the process of disarmament and of strengthening European security to a qualitatively new level could be the convening of a meeting of the leaders of the 35 States participating in the CSCE at which the results achieved on the continent in these fields would be examined and future tasks determined.

The participants felt that stability and security in Europe could not be fully reliable without a solution of the problem of tactical nuclear weapons. It is beyond doubt that as conventional weapons are reduced, the destabilizing effect of tactical nuclear weapons will inevitably increase. In this respect, the declaration stresses that NATO's plans to modernize tactical nuclear weapons are causing great concern. Noting a certain development in the positions of the NATO countries with respect to the negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty call on these countries to solve the problem of tactical nuclear weapons not by modernization but by separate negotiations, aimed at their step-by-step reduction. They reaffirmed their proposal made in that regard. The participants in the meeting expressed their support for the Soviet Union's intention to proceed to further unilateral reductions in tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Europe if the NATO countries were prepared to begin negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons. The participants in the Meeting also supported the Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally withdraw 500 warheads for tactical nuclear weapons from the territory of allied

(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

socialist States this year as well as its declaration that it is prepared to withdraw all nuclear weapons from the territory of its allies during the period 1989-1991 on condition that the United States takes a similar step.

Referring to the role of naval forces and their armaments and naval activities capable of exerting a destabilizing influence on the situation and creating a threat to security in Europe and other regions, the participants in the meeting advocated a more active dialogue on the problems and considered it necessary to begin separate negotiations for their consideration between the States concerned and first of all, between the major naval Powers. It was emphasized that a reduction in military spending allows the resources released to be directed to the needs of economic and social development. Accordingly, an effective solution to the problem of reconverting from military production acquires importance, and that might become the subject of international consultations, including consultations within the framework of the United Nations. Stress was also placed on the importance of joint and individual initiatives for promoting the solution of security problems in various regions of the continent. The States parties to the Warsaw Treaty consider that disarmament measures must be accompanied by appropriate measures to ensure strict and effective control. They are prepared to join in the most effective solutions leading to the creation of a comprehensive system of disarmament control. A positive role could be played in this connection by the United Nations.

The States parties to the Warsaw Treaty reiterate their appeal to the countries of the North Atlantic Alliance to utilize the opportunities now emerging to overcome all the consequences of the "cold war" in Europe and worldwide. The participants in the Meeting expressed support for the idea that relations between the Warsaw Treaty and the North Atlantic Alliance should evolve along non-confrontational lines, for the establishment of a constructive dialogue between them on political and military matters, for the development of that dialogue into a factor for security and co-operation on the continent. They maintained the position of principle of the Warsaw Treaty countries in favour of ridding Europe of military blocs, simultaneously disbanding both alliances and eliminating their military organizations as a first step. The strengthening of peace and security in Europe would contribute to the solution of many serious social problems faced by the peoples of the continent, thus guaranteeing their right to life and to work.

The participants in the Meeting stressed the need to give a firm rebuff to any manifestations of revanchism and chauvinism, to any attempts to sow discord among peoples. They share the concern of public opinion in the Western European countries by all manifestations of neo-fascism in those countries.

The allied socialist States attach prime importance to ensuring military, political and territorial stability in Europe. They start from the fact that each people has the right to determine its own country's future, to choose its own socio-political and economic system, the State system it thinks fit. There can be no single standard for the organization of society. Stability presupposes a renunciation of confrontation, and the policy of force and a rejection of direct or indirect interference in others' internal affairs. No country has the right to dictate events in another country, to set itself up

(Mr. Dolgu, Romania)

as arbiter and judge. The meeting was in favour of strengthening the solidarity and co-operation of the allied States and further developing their multilateral co-operation on the basis of equal rights and mutual respect for the benefit of their peoples of these countries and in the interests of universal peace. It was decided to continue efforts to strengthen the political character of the Warsaw Treaty and to improve the machinery for co-operation under the Treaty on a democratic basis. The participants in the Meeting informed one another about developments in their countries, about the progress and problems of socialist construction. They stressed the strong influence of socialist ideas, the importace of the changes taking place in the allied States aimed at improving and renewing socialist society, giving a new dynamism to its political and economic system, developing democracy, raising the standard of living and improving the quality of life for their peoples, promoting the self-realization of each individual, and safeguarding fundamental human rights and freedoms. They base themselves on the idea that there is no universal model of socialism, that no one has a monopoly of the truth. The building of a new society is a creative process which proceeds in keeping with the traditions, the specific conditions and the needs of each country. The participants reiterated their common desire to work in the interests of socialism and of improving collaboration between the allied States and preserving their lasting security. They expressed confidence in the capacity of the socialist States and the leading forces in society to resolve the problems that had arisen at the present stage of their development. The need was also stressed to develop relations among them on a basis of equality, independence and the right of each of them to work out its own political policy, strategy and tactics without outside interference.

To conclude, I should like to stress that the efforts of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty continue to have as their central goal the task of ensuring stability in Europe and the consolidation of a new type of relations on the continent, based on the elimination of confrontation and the strengthening of confidence and goodneighbourliness. The participants are in favour of broad co-operation on a mutually advantageous basis in a variety of areas and of the participation of all countries and peoples in settling the pressing problems of the continent. The common European process remains a key element in the construction of the new Europe.

These are some of the chief ideas in these important documents that I recommend to your attention.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Romania for his statement, and now I have the pleasure to give the floor to the distinguished representative of Poland, Ambassador Sujka.

Mr. SUJKA (Poland): Mr. President, allow me to express my particular pleasure at taking the floor under your presidency. You represent a brotherly socialist country with which Poland enjoys close and friendly relations. Your personal experience and skill are greatly contributing to the smooth proceeding of our work. I assure you of my delegation's fullest support.

Let me also express my gratitude to your predecessor in the Chair, Ambassador García Robles, for all his efforts to move our work forward. I would also like to extend my warm welcome to all the new colleagues who have

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

joined us in the Conference on Disarmament during this session and to assure them of my personal and my delegation's full co-operation. To their predecessors, I extend our best wishes for success in their new assignments.

In my today's statement I should like to concentrate on the chemical weapons ban. The Conference on Disarmament has started this year's consideration of this agenda item in very favourable conditions created by the successful conclusion of the Paris Conference. One hundred and forty nine countries expressed in the form of a final declaration their unequivocal demand for the conclusion at an early date of a convention aimed at total elimination of all chemical weapons. The Paris Declaration contains something we have been seeking for so long - clearly expressed political will, which is a decisive prerequisite for progress in our negotiations. This fresh political impetus generated by Paris was accompanied by the creative and competent guidance of the present Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee, Ambassador Pierre Morel. And, indeed, important steps were undertaken to intensify the pace of negotiations. I wish to pay our tribute also to Ambassador Morel's closest collaborators in this endeavour, the chairmen of the five working groups.

An organizational restructuring of the Committee aroused expectations of fulfilling the mandate of the Paris Conference to concentrate our redoubled efforts on resolving expeditiously the remaining unsolved issues. This approach offered additional opportunities to enter into the decisive stage of our negotiations towards finalizing the convention. Did we take full advantage of these opportunities? It is very difficult to give a fully satisfactory answer.

Undoubtedly, in the course of long years of negotiation we have made considerable progress. Ten years have passed since the year when an ad hoc subsidiary body for chemical weapons was established for the first time. It has been re-established in each of the subsequent years. We have been through several stages in the process of negotiations on the convention: starting from identifying its scope, outlines and structure, shaping its skeleton, through consecutive steps of fleshing it out with appropriate formulas reflecting the positions of the negotiators on different aspects of the convention, particularly on the scope of obligations, their substance and their structure, on different types, measures and mechanisms of verification of compliance with the convention, and on legal, technological, economic and financial aspects of the implementation process and its consequences. The present "rolling text" in fact contains agreed substantive material and an inventory of negotiator's positions on all envisaged articles of the convention. They differ in the degree of detail or in the scale of convergence. Nevertheless, we have a clear picture of the various problems and their ingredient elements, even those which need further elaboration or on which divergences still exist. We call them "outstanding issues".

The harvest of 10 years of the Committee's work is really rich and significant. It is especially so in view of the complexity of the subject of the negotiation, unprecedented from the point of view of its scope as well as the number of participants. What is more, in many cases the output of our work actually exceeds the requirements of the process of drafting the convention. The collected material can not only be used for the elaboration

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

of the draft text of the convention, but will be valuable in creating the necessary understanding for a process of preparing for its entry into force as well as during the whole implementation period. A question arises whether this collected material constitutes a sufficient basis for the final draft of the convention. I think that in principle the answer could be positive.

What do we have at our disposal now? Firstly, clearly expressed political will; secondly, statements of position by negotiators on all the principal problems and, to a large extent, on specific aspects of the draft, including technical details; thirdly, a large convergence in the positions of the negotiators, extensive areas of agreement; fourthly, awareness of existing loopholes, their scale and interrelationships existing between them; fifthly, necessary negotiating experience gathered during these 10 years; sixthly, well-disposed attitude of the chemical industry to the convention; seventhly, effective engagement of various scientific and research institutes in the search for possible solutions to different technical problems; eighthly, pressure of world public opinion, justifiably concerned on well-known grounds. Then what is lacking? The answer is not so easy. We can assume that each of us has his own recipe for speeding up the process of negotiations. These recipes have been put forward in this forum. To various remarks presented here I would like to add just one, and in the form of a question - are the methods applied in our negotiations during the last three or four years adequate to the present advanced stage of negotiations? Or to put it in another way - whether penetrating more deeply into different problems - so to say, entering further into the forest, we do not concentrate too much of our attention on discovering and studying wonderful new trees. Could we not start in the coming session with sorting them out and selecting only those which are necessary as elements to be used in raising our building? After all, not all of these wonderful trees we come across are suitable and in fact necessary for our construction. Otherwise we can be lost in the forest.

Let me illustrate this with an example of the complex problem of verification. In the course of the process of negotiations we have made considerable progress. Exchanges of views on this subject during the present session, both in plenary meetings and in Group 1 of the Ad Hoc Committee, as well as during very intensive consultations of the Chairman of the Committee, have contributed further to this progress. We are also looking forward to the results of the eleventh round of USSR-United States bilateral consultations.

Taking into account the scale of progress, should not we ask whether our efforts to finalize negotiations on outstanding technical and procedural elements of the process of verification would not be facilitated if we tried to approach them from the point of view of their place and functions in a general pattern of verification? To reach an understanding on such a pattern is - I firmly believe - the crucial point for us now. This understanding could possibly help us to realize more clearly the borderline between the necessary level of guarantees to ensure that there is no breach of the convention and the level of intrusiveness of the envisaged systems and types of verification. To the same extent it could enable us to see the necessity of a proper balance between the required level of effectiveness of verification and its costs, as well as the preservation of confidentiality to

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

meet the requirements of the chemical industry's interests. This approach, it seems, could also help us to find the proper place in the verification system as a whole for one of the outstanding verification issues, namely, the most relevant production capabilities.

Let me add a brief comment on this very issue. It becomes evident that concentrating upon the most relevant chemicals does not automatically ensure that the capabilities are covered. During one of the industrial experts' meetings an interesting sentence was uttered: "The modern chemical facility which cannot produce a tabun is just not a modern one." It is not difficult to imagine that possible breach is more likely in undeclared facilities than in declared. It is therefore important to consider possible measures to cover at least to some extent facilities that do not produce or process any of the scheduled chemicals but pose a risk to the convention. In this very context we are also prepared to discuss further the United Kingdom's proposal for ad hoc inspections.

I should like to take another example from a different part of the "rolling text" - namely, articles X and XI. We are to try here another approach, namely, to narrow different views towards reaching a compromise solution. We can use here in this context a rule of logic which draws a kind of measure from the purpose. Although these articles deal with rights and obligations of States in two different spheres, their common function should be to stimulate positive interest in the convention so as to ensure its universality. We are to look for a solution of the divergences so clearly exposed in the text such as could make possible a compromise between the need to make the convention attractive and the desire of States to keep their chemical industries competitive.

Another element which is to be taken into consideration in our negotiations is the need for a cautious approach to the "rolling text". It is troubling that there should be more and more frequent returns to consideration of tentatively agreed parts of the text, returns which are justified neither by a change of position on a given aspect nor by progress on another, related part of the text. I would not like to be interpreted as implying that my delegation is wholly against renewed discussion on provisions on which convergence of views has been achieved. Nevertheless, at this stage of negotiations it is preferable not to take a step back if it would not result in making two steps ahead, so as to have at least a step-by-step progress. Otherwise we contribute ourselves to prolongation of the negotiating process.

I have touched upon only some aspects of agenda item 4. My delegation strongly believes that conditions have been created to undertake decisive efforts on this issue. I fully agree with all preceding speakers who have expressed their concern that we might lose momentum towards achieving the complete elimination of chemical weapons. There are legitimate reasons for critical assessment of the pace of negotiations on this item. The more so as in the rather quiet waters of our Conference the negotiations on this agenda item constitute a kind of "island of hope" for the Conference not to be in the deep arrière-garde of present disarmament efforts. It is an "island of hope" because an agreement seems to be within reach and because one can expect a positive impact of this agreement on other parts of our agenda.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

At the end of my statement let me turn briefly to the more general question of the effective and improved functioning of the Conference on Disarmament. This issue has been occupying our minds for a long time. In present circumstances, however, it is becoming more and more urgent. My delegation regrets that the Conference has not been able to undertake a serious discussion on this subject during this session.

There is a significant transformation of the traditional pattern and atmosphere in East-West relations. Confrontation is giving way to co-operation. Ideological differences are yielding to growing understanding of common responsibility for our common future. Substantial positive changes have appeared in many regional conflicts which for a long time had been a source of tension and mistrust. The United Nations is becoming an efficient instrument in resolving these regional conflicts. There is a visible improvement in its peace-keeping potential. Increased confidence in the United Nations system is creating new opportunities for further co-operative efforts. New rounds of European negotiations on the reduction of forces and armaments and on confidence- and security-building measures seem to open up a new and promising chapter for this continent. Last but not least, experience of the INF treaty negotiations and its implementation encourage high hopes for a positive outcome to the crucial bilateral United States-USSR talks. Significant changes have appeared not only in the practice of international disarmament negotiations but in the very approach to this problem. A revolution in our thinking about verification issues, traditionally a stumbling block in many disarmament endeavours, is a good example of this point.

Comparing these developments with our results we must very seriously ponder upon the place and role of this Conference in the major processes at present taking place in the world. Let me add to this that there is also a great disproportion between the outcome of our efforts and the political will demonstrated in our debate; between the slow progress of our work and the great diplomatic and intellectual potential gathered in our Conference, represented by highly qualified diplomats surrounding this table and the many highly experienced experts present in or visiting our delegations. This situation does concern my Government. In fact, "time is working against us" - as the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Jaroszek, stressed in April this year in this hall. The inability to make any visible and concrete progress not only contributes to growing concern on the part of public opinion, but - let us honestly face this fact - undermines the credibility of this forum.

The intention of these remarks is not to drive us to despair but rather to stress the need for a candid and sober look at our Conference. What can be done to prevent it from being moved to the margin of world politics? How to ensure that this Conference responds better to new situations, new opportunities and requirements? My delegation strongly believes that the issue of the improved and effective functioning of the Conference deserves our serious consideration and should stay permanently on the agenda of our formal and informal consultations, both here and in our capitals, before the end of this session as well as in the forthcoming break.

(Mr. Sujka, Poland)

Let me present to you some considerations of my delegation related to only one aspect of this question. Taking into account the importance of the questions discussed at the Conference our principal aim should remain the elaboration of new agreements establishing international legal obligations upon States. Because of the complexity of those problems, their delicacy and their direct impact on the security of States, this work is - and will continue to be - laborious and time-consuming.

This basic approach need not, however, prevent the Conference from undertaking other measures, particularly in situations where the stage reached in negotiations or other considerations could make them advisable and the only ones feasible. Different situations may require different approaches and responses. And one of these responses could be confidence- and security-building measures. They must not necessarily have the character of legal instruments, but should reflect political commitment and provide some political guidance, which, if followed, would prompt further co-operation in the matters under consideration and facilitate further discussion. Such measures could, for example, be registered and approved by the Conference as a part of its annual reports.

The CD rules of procedure provide that negotiations can be conducted on draft treaties and other draft texts. They provide also that reports of the Conference can contain inter alia conclusions, decisions and other relevant documents. Thus, there is nothing to prevent the Conference from agreeing on some documents which are not intended to be treaties yet, but which - when it becomes possible - could evolve into, or be part of, binding international rules. This approach could make our work more flexible and more productive. One can assume also that a growing number of such measures will have an important impact on international confidence and security and help in our treaty-making endeavours, which remain of course our main responsibility.

The Polish delegation notes with attention increasing interest at this Conference in this category of measures. CSBMs have played a useful role in other international negotiations, particularly in the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We believe that they can also make our Conference a more flexible and live instrument, responding better to different needs and allowing it to use all opportunities to make its contribution to international peace and security. Having this in mind, my delegation has proposed for further consideration a set of measures related to our discussion on prevention of an arms race in outer space.

To conclude, Poland is strongly attached to this forum of disarmament negotiations. We consider the Conference as an important and, in fact, indispensable instrument of world-wide disarmament efforts. It has proved its usefulness and there are important tasks before it. We understand the complexity of issues on its agenda. We believe, however, that to solve them more determined efforts are needed. If we are not able to undertake such efforts, there will be growing frustration inside this Conference and increasing criticism from outside.

The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I thank the distinguished representative of Poland for his statement and for his kind words about my country and the presidency.

I have no more speakers on my list for today. Does any other delegation wish to speak? That does not seem to be the case. There are no more matters to be considered today, and I shall therefore adjourn the meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be on Thursday, 27 July, at 10 a.m.

The plenary meeting is adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.